

1 I'm the District Manager for Southern California Gas
2 Company.

3 First, let me state that we have no position on
4 the proposed Cabrillo Port LNG facility. Rather, we believe
5 it is up to the local communities and the appropriate
6 regulatory agencies to decide if, and where, LNG facilities
7 should be sited, and what mitigation measures will be
8 required for approved facilities.

9 I'm here, speaking to you this afternoon, to
10 respond to questions that have arisen about two issues, the
11 safety of our pipeline system and the need for this natural
12 gas.

13 Gas from this, and any other site that gets built
14 in Southern California will be fed into the Gas Company's
15 natural gas pipeline system. This Gas Company will build,
16 operate, maintain, and own the terrestrial part of the
17 proposed pipeline system.

18 First, let me address the safety of our pipeline
19 system. Safety is the Gas Company's most important
20 priority. We devote a lot of time and effort to ensure that
21 we provide safe and reliable service.

22 Here's some of what we do. First of all, new
23 facilities follow design and construction practices that
24 include conservative design factors, and rigid inspection
25 and testing prior to being put into service.

T003-4.1

T003-4.1
Thank you for the information.

T003-4.1
(cont'd)

1 For existing pipelines, we regularly conduct leak
2 surveys and patrols to identify potential leaks or problems.
3 Cathodic protection, a system designed to prevent steel
4 pipes from deteriorating, has been installed on all of our
5 transmission pipelines.

6 In addition, whenever we work on a line we look
7 for potential problems and analyze stump holes of our pipe.
8 We also periodically analyze liquids that routinely enter
9 the pipeline with natural gas.

10 Additionally, for the last several years, we have
11 had a pipeline integrity program to evaluate the condition
12 of our pipe, our transmission pipelines. As part of this
13 program we assess potential risk, inspect pipelines, and
14 take needed corrective action, that may include repair or
15 replacement of pipeline. We are currently spending
16 approximately 35 million a year on this program.

17 All of these steps help us determine the condition
18 of our pipes and when we recognize a potential problem, we
19 take steps to prevent it from becoming an actual problem.

20 The California Public Utilities Commission
21 regularly inspects our facilities and audits our activities.
22 During the last ten years we have not had -- we have not
23 been fined by the CPUC for any pipeline safety incidents.

24 Also, during the same time period we have not had
25 any injuries to the public related to failure of our

1 transmission pipeline system. In fact, during the more than
2 130 years we have been operating the natural gas delivery
3 system throughout Southern California there have been few
4 incidents involving our pipeline.

5 Thank you for the time.

6 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

7 The next series of speakers will be Ed Ellis, Jim
8 Woolway, thomas McCormick, Jane Tolmach, John Reid, and
9 Nancy Pedersen.

10 Mr. Ellis.

11 MR. ELLIS: Good afternoon. My name is Ed Ellis
12 and I'm a concerned citizen. I have raised nine children in
13 this city and I now have 21 grandchildren and 8 great-
14 grandchildren. And my concern, as an accident being what it
15 is, and after reading the EIS/EIR report, I could not find
16 any mention of who would be responsible to the City of
17 Oxnard and its citizens for damage caused by a catastrophic
18 LNG accident.

19 Perhaps BHP Billiton could take out a performance
20 bond, you know, and give it to the city to hold, in the
21 event that ever happened.

22 The other thing I noticed that was nowhere in this
23 EIS/EIR were there any new, real world scientific models
24 performed to ascertain what the real damage to our area
25 would be if the FSRU or an incoming LNG vessel, carrying 33

T003-5.1

Section 4.2.5 contains information on the Applicant's insurance coverage and cost recovery for incidents.

T003-5.2

The Independent Risk Assessment (IRA) has been updated since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. The lead agencies directed preparation of the current IRA, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories independently reviewed it, as discussed in Section 4.2 and Appendix C.

Section 4.2.7.6 and the IRA (Appendix C1) discuss the models and assumptions used and the verification process. Sandia National Laboratories (Appendix C2) concluded that the models used were appropriate and produced valid results.

COMMENTER
T003-5

T003-5.1

T003-5.2

1 million gallons of LNG, were to spill into our waters or
2 explode.

3 I thought these types of tests used worst
4 conditions to determine the consequences. As I understand
5 it, the only computer models were performed using 10,000
6 gallons of LNG in the 1970s.

7 Please, before this project goes any further, have
8 computer simulations with a 33 million gallon spill and
9 explosion. Also include winds, tides, et cetera.

10 My grandkids and great-grandkids have to live with
11 this stinking bomb. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Jim Woolway.

14 MR. WOOLWAY: I'm Jim Woolway, I'm a retired Naval
15 officer and I'm also a retired Merchant Marine officer. I
16 spent 26 years in the Navy and commanded several Navy ships,
17 including a destroyer.

18 I retired from the Navy and got my master's
19 license from the Coast Guard, and immediately went to LNG
20 school, in Baltimore, Maryland, for two months and received
21 my training there before I went out to the LNG ships, the
22 ones that carry about 125,000 cubic meters of LNG to Japan,
23 and we did that for -- I did that for 16 years. The company
24 I was with, of course, continued on after I left.

25 But the thing I wanted to say is that -- oh, and

T003-5.2
(cont'd)

T003-6.1
Thank you for the information.

COMMENTER
T003-6

T003-6.1

1 by the way, I live in Chula Vista, California, so I'm
2 interested, as a California citizen, in this LNG project.

3 I guess, in a way, I wanted just to perhaps reduce
4 the concerns of some of the people who really don't have all
5 the facts on LNG.

6 The ship I was aboard, and as I say I went to
7 school for several months and trained for eight months
8 before I became the cargo officer, and chief mate, and
9 relief master on one of the LNG ships in the Pacific trade,
10 from Borneo and Somatra, delivering to Japan.

11 And unlike the proposed Cabrillo Port system, we
12 actually went into port, right in Nogoya, and Osaka, right
13 in the inland sea there, and to deliver our cargo. We did
14 that for 16 years, when I was there.

15 And when I was aboard, you might say I had charge
16 of the care and feeding of LNG. It was a 24/7 operation in
17 which we monitored and took better care of it than I think
18 you would do in your own kitchens, obviously.

19 So the big thing I would emphasize is with well-
20 trained crews you're delivering a cargo that is nontoxic, it
21 just doesn't mix toxically with anything. The worst thing
22 it will do is it will give you a terrible burn, if you get
23 it on your hands.

24 But the thing is it goes in a ship, where it's not
25 carrying any pressure except, say, about one pound of

T003-6.1
(cont'd)

1 pressure. And we delivered it through Singapore Straits, a
2 very busy area, and I did that with seven sister ships, and
3 we never had a problem. We loaded it safely, we delivered
4 it safely, and we transported it safely through very busy
5 waters, and it was done without incident for 16 years.

6 I hope that would give some of you pause that
7 we're talking about a very safe operation, in which when you
8 have trained people, you can handle in a responsible way.

9 And I'd just like to extend those informational
10 comments to you, as someone who actually worked with it on a
11 day-to-day basis. Thank you.

12 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thomas McCormick.

15 MR. MC CORMICK: I'm Thomas McCormick, I'm a
16 marine biologist.

17 I've worked for two decades in the Ormond Beach
18 area, and I might say, just adjacent to the existing natural
19 gas line there.

20 For all intents and purposes, that line is
21 undetectable. I've worked, as I say, very close to it, and
22 you can't even tell it's there.

23 I've looked at the EIR report and found that, in
24 my estimation, the impacts to the marine life appear to be
25 minimized due to the site selection and the design criteria.

T003-6.1
(cont'd)

T003-7.1
Thank you for the information.

COMMENTER
T003-7

T003-7.1

1 Likewise, impacts on the Ormond Beach area seem to
2 be minimized through the buried shore crossing.

3 We must keep in mind that California imports over
4 80 percent of our natural gas, and it is one of the cleanest
5 fossil fuels that we can use. It is a fuel that's necessary
6 to run Southern California economy and drive existing and
7 new technologies.

8 Just yesterday, in the L.A. Times, David
9 Baltimore, who is President of CalTech, and a Nobel
10 Laureate, in a commentary on science he noted that if -- and
11 I quote, "if technology is done well and more cheaply
12 abroad, we will either have to seriously reduce salaries
13 here, or see technology intensive jobs go abroad."

14 With proper planning, I believe that we should not
15 have to face either of these measures. Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

18 The next speaker is Jane Tolmach.

19 MS. TOLMACH: My name is Jane McCormick Tolmach,
20 and I'm not related to Tom. The safety zone around -- I'm
21 just a --

22 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Could you pull the mike
23 down closer to your mouth?

24 MS. TOLMACH: Down, yeah.

25 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

T003-7.1
(cont'd)

T003-7.2

T003-7.2

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T003-8

1 MS. TOLMACH: I'm just a local resident and former
2 City Council member.

3 The safety zone around the FSRU is so under-
4 estimated that the EIR does not fully evaluate the effect on
5 the military bases, of this LNG facility. There's no
6 examination of the limitations on activity in the general
7 area when an LNG supertanker ship approaches the FSRU. What
8 does the Coast Guard require when an LNG tanker approaches
9 Boston Harbor?

10 The approval of this project could end up with the
11 federal government finding that the mission of the military
12 bases was harmed by the project and that it would be better
13 to close the bases, which would be a local disaster,
14 financially. The military bases our are biggest and best
15 employers.

16 This issue is not examined by the EIR. That is a
17 risk that we cannot take.

18 The project proposed is all based on nonexistent
19 circumstances. Just hopes page -- let's see, page 2-12 in
20 the EIR.

21 "The application anticipates --
22 applicant anticipates importing high
23 quality natural gas to this project when
24 Western Australia, Scarborough, offshore
25 gas field is developed and a

T003-8.1

T003-8.1

Section 4.3.1.4 and Appendix C3-2 contain information on safety and security measures. The LNG tankers entering Boston Harbor would have comparable requirements as directed by the local Captain of the Port.

Section 4.3.4 contains information on potential impacts associated with the increased vessel traffic due to the proposed Project. The FSRU would be located 3.5 NM (3.54 miles) from the eastern boundary of the Point Mugu Sea Range (Pacific Missile Range). Impacts MT-5 and MT-6 in Section 4.3.4 address potential Project impacts on Naval and Point Mugu Sea Range operations.

1 liquefaction facility and terminal is
2 constructed. The field, located on the
3 Exmouth plateau, 174 miles west of the
4 Western Australia Coast, in water about
5 2,900 feet deep, reportedly contains
6 about 8 trillion cubic feet --"

7 All of this is quoted from the EIR.

8 -- "that will import natural gas from."

9 And if this doesn't come online in time, the
10 operator, applicant, says that they'll import from some
11 other source.

12 Under what flag will the vessels sail? That's
13 been discussed a little bit by you.

14 And who's going to pay for public liability
15 insurance under the applicant's plan? If there is an
16 accident, will the U.S. Coast Guard and State Lands
17 Commission be liable, if they approve this project over the
18 objection of the City Council, of the City of Oxnard?

19 Would the Governor be liable, since he has the
20 power to stop the project? That would be if there is an
21 accident.

22 Why does this EIR discuss the 1977 LNG Terminal
23 Act without noting that it was --

24 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Mrs. Tolmach?

25 MS. TOLMACH: Uh-hum.

T003-8.2

Sections 4.2.7.3 and 4.3.1.5 contain information on the use of American crews and U.S.-flagged vessels.

T003-8.3

Section 4.2.5 contains information on liability in case of an accident and reimbursement for local agencies.

T003-8.4

Section 4.2.3, the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1), and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories' review of the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C2) contain revised information on the 1977 Oxnard study.

T003-8.2

T003-8.3

T003-8.4

1 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: I'm sorry, your three
2 minutes is up.

3 MS. TOLMACH: Oh, I was looking at the wrong
4 person. I'm sorry.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Yeah. Okay, there will be
7 maybe time for second helpings at the end.

8 MS. TOLMACH: What I'm going to do is just
9 I'll --

10 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: If you have a written
11 comment, you can hand it in to me and we'll make sure it's
12 entered into the record.

13 MS. TOLMACH: Yeah, yeah.

14 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. All
15 right.

16 Our next speaker is John Reid.

17 MR. REID: Well, good afternoon. I'll try and
18 look at the right timekeeper and stay within my time limits.

COMMENTER
T003-9

19 My name is John Reid. I'm a third generation
20 Californian, an attorney admitted to practice in California
21 and three other states, and a long-time resident of Ventura
22 County.

23 I'm here, today, to support the Cabrillo Port
24 project. The State of California, if it were a country,
25 would be the sixth largest economy in the world, and

T003-9.1

T003-9.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

1 California is an economy that runs on energy. The energy is
2 electricity and one of the best ways to generate electricity
3 is with natural gas.

4 Unfortunately, California does not have enough
5 natural gas reserves of its own, or ways to import all the
6 natural gas it needs.

7 Cabrillo Port would provide that energy in the
8 form of LNG imported from Australia, one of our major
9 trading partners, and a long-standing ally, and a secure
10 source of supply, as noted earlier.

11 I am very familiar with LNG, having had the
12 opportunity to work with LNG projects for many years.
13 First, in Libya, and more recently for years in Qatar, as
14 the Vice-President and Counsel for Mobile Oil Qatar.

15 LNG provides a good part of the electricity for
16 Japan, Korea, Spain, Italy, and soon the United Kingdom.
17 Thousands of cargos of LNG have been safely manufactured,
18 transported by tanker, and discharged into receiving
19 terminals around the world in the last four decades, and its
20 use is increasing rapidly.

21 In the U.S., LNG is becoming ever more needed as
22 our own natural gas fields reach the end of their useful
23 lives.

24 LNG receiving terminals are not a safety threat,
25 as demonstrated by the operations of the LNG terminal in

T003-9.2

T003-9.2
Thank you for the information.

T003-9.2
(cont'd)

1 Boston Harbor, since the early 1970s, immediately adjacent
2 to the City of Boston.

3 Cabrillo Port is the safest LNG receiving terminal
4 I have seen proposed to date, based on the fact that it will
5 be located 14 miles out to sea.

6 There has never been a major explosion at an LNG
7 receiving terminal, and in the unlikely event that one were
8 to occur at Cabrillo Port, its location would ensure that no
9 damage occurred to anything located on the adjacent land.

10 I'm the Chairman of the Resident's Roundtable in
11 Thousand Oaks, and I know that one of our difficulties is
12 finding enough land to support our residents and our
13 industries.

14 I like this project because it's offshore, it
15 doesn't take away from that limited land bank that we have
16 available here, in the county, to support all of our needs.

17 Furthermore, the visual impact of this project is
18 very minimal. As anyone could see, who's looked at the
19 graphics in the open house, that demonstrated it would
20 simply be a small speck off in the distance.

21 I urge quick approval of the Cabrillo Port project
22 so work can go forward to provide all of us, in California,
23 with the energy that our State so urgently needs.

24 Thank you.

25 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: After our next speaker,
3 Nancy Pedersen, the speakers will be Peter Cooper, Trevor
4 Smith, Howard Smith, and Leah Lacayo. If you would go ahead
5 and use the reserved seating up here, in the front row, I'd
6 really appreciate it.

7 MS. PEDERSEN: Good afternoon. I previously
8 objected, at the other hearings, to the proposed pipeline,
9 which went down Rice Road, which is a major truck route,
10 turned on Gonzales to go past St. John's Hospital, and then
11 went past the entire length of the shopping centers on
12 either side of Rose, to cross 101 Freeway.

13 Because of that, they've no rerouted the pipeline
14 and, in my view, all they've done is switched it from one
15 area to another, one danger to another.

16 Now, it goes past a truck stop, which has propane,
17 it has diesel, it has gasoline, it has about 85 to 100
18 trucks that go there each day. Each one carries its own
19 fuel and a lot of them are there just to weigh in and leave
20 to go East.

21 It also goes by an oil refinery that's very close
22 to the truck stop. Also, close to the truck stop is a
23 trucking firm that hauls hazardous materials, which they
24 sometimes store at their yard while they're waiting to load
25 or unload. All of this makes it a very dangerous area to

T003-10.1

Section 2.4 contains information on the proposed Center Road pipeline route.

T003-10.2

Section 4.13.1.3 contains information on land uses along the proposed Center Road Pipeline route.

Section 4.2.8.2 contains information on regulations regarding pipelines. Appendix C3-3 contains information on design and safety standards applicable to natural gas projects. The Applicant would design, install, operate, maintain, and inspect pipelines to meet regulatory requirements. Industrial land uses near pipelines would not be restricted with the implementation of these regulations.

COMMENTER
T003-10

T003-10.1

T003-10.2

40

T003-10.2
(cont'd)

1 have an additional 36-inch gas pipeline going by.

2 I really feel that they have tried to move to a
3 safer area, but I think they're not looking at the area, I
4 think they're just looking at lines on a map. They need to
5 look at what they're going by. They need to look at the
6 fact that this is a very densely populated area. The
7 population density in Oxnard is absolutely appalling, if you
8 look at the census.

9 We have two Navy bases, we have an airport, we
10 have a harbor, we have lots of gas refinery places, we have
11 lots of oil wells. We have a lot of very dangerous things
12 that are coexisting at the moment. We really don't need to
13 add another danger to the mix.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The last speaker did not
17 identify herself, that was Nancy Pedersen.

18 MR. COOPER: Hello, I am Peter Cooper, with the
19 California Labor Federation.

20 The Labor Federation represents 2.1 million
21 workers in the State of California, all across the State,
22 and we represent workers in a wide variety of industries.

23 And I'll have some written comments I'll submit
24 later, but now I just have a few points that I'd like to
25 make.

T003-10.3

T003-10.3

Section 4.13.1.3 contains information on this topic. Also see Figure 4.13-2.

T003-10.4

Sections 4.10, 4.13, and 4.17 contain information on these topics.

T003-11.1

Thank you for the information.

T003-10.4

COMMENTER
T003-11

T003-11.1

T003-11.1
(cont'd)

1 We believe that liquified natural gas holds many
2 benefits for Californians, and thus support its large-scale
3 importation. And more specifically, the proposal by BHP
4 Billiton for its Cabrillo Port LNG Offshore Terminal
5 project, is something that we support.

6 One of the primary benefits that LNG brings to the
7 California economy is that it is an affordable alternative
8 to conventional fuels as a means of producing electricity or
9 heating the homes of our residents. California's working
10 families will benefit when this less-expensive fuel source
11 becomes more widely available.

12 The Federation also believes that LNG can be part
13 of the solution to the air quality problems faced by the
14 people of California, especially a problem throughout the
15 State. I'm coming from Sacramento, but I know it's a
16 problem down in Southern California, as well.

17 As fuel -- as a fuel that burns more cleanly than
18 oil, natural gas has the potential to dramatically reduce
19 air pollution over time.

20 For a myriad of reasons, the LNG industry should
21 employ only union workers. And let me explain this. The
22 workers are the cornerstone of safety and security in the
23 LNG industry. The industry's viability with regard to the
24 economy, environment, and safety is predicated on the skills
25 and abilities of its workforce. They must be extremely well

1 trained and not afraid of employer retaliation should they
2 voice a safety concern about their work conditions or work
3 situation.

T003-11.1
(cont'd)

T003-11.2

Sections 4.2.7.3 and 4.3.1.5 contain information on the use of American crews and U.S.-flagged vessels.

4 One of our affiliates, the Marine Engineers
5 Beneficial Association, MEBA, is one of our unions that does
6 have extensive experience with LNG. The Federation also
7 represents some unions in other maritime industry -- parts
8 of the maritime industry, including the Longshoremen's
9 Union, and others.

T003-11.2

T003-11.3

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

10 The Federation believes that only vessels
11 employing union-trained workers should be permitted to
12 import LNG to California.

13 The Federation has a long-term commitment to
14 slowing the export of American jobs. The maritime industry
15 has been one of those hardest hit by the offshoring of jobs
16 to low-wage countries. There's a growing trend, by multi-
17 national corporations, to offshore more and more jobs, and
18 thus boost their quarterly profits.

19 With this ratcheting down of wages, however, comes
20 a ratcheting down of worker rights, training levels, and
21 safety.

22 The support of the Federation for the Cabrillo
23 Port project is thus contingent upon a commitment by the
24 sponsors to adhere to strong safety and security measures
25 and to employ only union workers.

T003-11.3

1 Thank you.

2 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is Trevor
3 Smith.

4 MR. HOWARD SMITH: My name is Howard Smith, and I
5 represent the Ventura Economic Development Association.

COMMENTER
T003-12

6 The Board of VCEDA, as it's commonly known,
7 recently elected and approved, in theory, the project,
8 that's the Cabrillo project.

T003-12.1

9 As California and Ventura County continue adapting
10 to new, alternative energy sources, the following is a
11 reality in our State. The energy crisis and rolling
12 blackouts suffered by California in the past few years were
13 not due to -- I'm sorry, were due to a lack of supply and
14 competition in the natural gas industry. We were at the
15 end, not the beginning, of gas pipelines that power our
16 electrical generators, businesses, and homes.

17 Californians need plentiful and available supplies
18 of natural gas because they're used to heat and cool our
19 homes, our schools, our hospitals, create electrical energy
20 to light our way, cook and refrigerate our food, and power
21 vital medical equipment.

22 The California Energy Commission, the CEC,
23 estimates that the demand for all uses of natural
24 gas -- gas, I'm sorry, will grow by approximately one
25 percent annually over the next ten years, even taking into

T003-12.1
Thank you for the information.

1 account increased conservation and the use of renewable
2 energy resources.

3 Natural gas is clean burning, compared to other
4 petroleum-based products, such as oil, coal, gasoline and,
5 therefore, provides significant air quality benefits.

6 Because of suppliers who care, and regulators who
7 demand it, the use of natural gas has been safe and is used
8 in most homes and business throughout California.

9 The current sources of natural gas are dwindling
10 and, in some cases, future sources, such as constructing
11 long pipelines through and from the Rocky Mountains, or from
12 Alaska, involve greater environmental impacts and less
13 sensitive methods of transportation.

14 Natural gas in a liquid form, as a method of
15 transportation, has been proven to be safe, viable, and an
16 economic means of delivering natural gas to retailers.

17 Natural gas in a liquid form, delivered and
18 regasified off the Coast of California, would result in
19 economically sound and more economic means providing a
20 stable, cost-effective supply of natural gas to California.

21 Therefore, the VCEDA has determined that we
22 support the use of liquified natural gas, for the reasons
23 stated above, and the projects that are deemed to be safe
24 and environmentally sound.

25 The draft EIR/EIS for the Cabrillo Port appears to

T003-12.1
(cont'd)

T003-12.2

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T003-12.2

1 provide decision makers with accurate and complete analysis
2 of the environmental impacts associated with delivering to
3 California by transporting LNG to offshore facilities, if
4 mitigations proposed are in place.

5 VCEDA expects, and its support is premised, upon
6 the assumption that the project owners will fully implement
7 the mitigation measures and comply with all required safety
8 and environmental safeguards included in the draft EIR/EIS,
9 and that the supply of natural gas, by the means proposed in
10 the draft EIR/EIS, will provide the State of California with
11 a safe, steady, and economic supply of natural gas through
12 competitive markets, for the foreseeable future.

13 And I have a draft copy of this, and also a
14 personal statement that I'll turn in as well. Thank you.

15 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: It's Howard Smith, correct?

18 MR. HOWARD SMITH: Yes.

19 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: I called Trevor Smith. Are
20 you Trevor?

21 MR. TREVOR SMITH: Yes.

22 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Okay, you're up next, then.

23 MR. TREVOR SMITH: Trevor Smith, a resident,
24 homeowner down in the beach area of Oxnard, for a long term.

25 I have some concerns about the statements that

T003-12.2
(cont'd)

T003-12.3

T003-12.3

The lead Federal and State agencies share the responsibility to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented. Table 6.1-1 in Chapter 6 is the basis for the Mitigation Monitoring Program, which would be implemented, consistent with section 15097(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, to ensure that each mitigation measure is incorporated into Project design, construction, operation, and maintenance activities. Additionally, the USCG would review and approve deepwater port construction drawings in accordance with 46 CFR 149.620. This review, along with USCG inspections and classification society surveys during the construction and installation of the deepwater port, would ensure compliance with applicable international, national, and industrial regulations and standards and with mitigation measures noted in this EIS/EIR and any conditions noted in the deepwater port's license.

Table 6.1-1 lists mitigation measures. MARAD and the USCG have joint responsibility for implementation of these mitigation measures, as required by various Federal laws.

COMMENTS
T003-13

1 natural gas is a truly alternate, far superior, cleaner
2 burning fuel, and I have some comparisons from a retired
3 engineer from GE Aircraft Engines, Joseph D. Cohen. And he
4 says that "Coal produces 300 pounds of CO2 per million BTUs
5 of thermal energy consumed. That fuel oil produces 175
6 pounds of CO2 per million BTUs of thermal energy consumed.
7 And natural gas produces 130 pounds."

8 So natural gas is a little bit less than half as
9 polluting as burning just coal. So when you talk about
10 bringing over a hundred of the world's largest tankers to
11 our coast, I interpret that as 50 coal burning tankers to
12 our coast, whereas before we had no coal-burning quantity of
13 emissions.

14 If you add to that the two tugs, the support
15 vessels, and the security operations of the Navy and the
16 Coast Guard, or the private security, or whatever it's going
17 to be, you have a lot of, maybe 75 shiploads of coal-burning
18 coming. So I think that it poses a potential threat.

19 In the EIR, I just glanced through it to see what
20 they say. Yes, they acknowledge that the air pollution will
21 exceed the allowable limit, so there will have to be
22 mitigations.

23 Another website, down in Los Angeles, disclosed
24 that the South Coast Air Quality Management District sought
25 to intervene with the FERC in the Long Beach LNG proposal,

T003-13.1

T003-13.1
Thank you for the information.

T003-13.2
The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. See Section 1.4.2 for a summary of Project changes. Impact AIR-8 in Section 4.6.4 contains an updated analysis of impacts on air quality from the FSRU and Project vessels.

T003-13.2

T003-13.3
The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. See Section 1.4.2 for a summary of Project changes. Section 4.6.1.3 contains revised information on Project emissions and proposed control measures. Section 4.6.4 discusses the health effects attributed to air pollutants and includes revised impacts and mitigation measures.

T003-13.3

1 and they claim that "the facility would be expected to be a
2 substantial source of air contaminants that contribute to
3 the basin's current violations of federal health-based, air
4 quality standards for ozone, sulfur oxides, and tiny
5 particles, smaller than ten microns."

6 So I don't know if we're going to pollute our air
7 up here and give credit to Long Beach, so that they can have
8 a little bit better air quality, or what the deal is.

9 But I think that there's been a lot of breaking
10 news in the last few days, that I think you need to slow
11 this process down a little bit and bring in some of the
12 latest stories. There's a story about the Port of Long
13 Beach being invaded with foreign vessels because of the
14 lifting of the textile embargo, and that they're
15 anticipating more, and more, and more deliveries, and more
16 and more pollution.

17 And I also believe that the Port of Hueneme has
18 also announced that they would like to increase their
19 capacity by 25 percent in the near future. I'm sure they
20 would like to take the overflow from the Los Angeles ports.

21 And I think these are all cumulative impacts that
22 really need to be addressed.

23 Now, the number one claim that this EIR makes is
24 that it's going to comply with the CEQA process. And to my
25 knowledge, the CEQA process requires that the public has a

T003-13.3
(cont'd)

T003-13.4

Section 4.20.1.3 discusses this topic.

T003-13.5

Section 4.20.1.9 discusses expansion of Port of Hueneme warehouses. Section 4.20.3.3 discusses the marine traffic impacts of this expansion.

T003-13.6

Both NEPA and the CEQA require the consideration of alternatives to a proposed project. A lead agency's lack of jurisdiction over a potential alternative is one factor that it may consider in determining if a potential alternative is feasible, reasonable, and merits detailed study in an EIS/EIR. Whether a potential alternative is purely hypothetical or speculative, or whether the potential alternative can be accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time are additional factors the lead agency may consider in assessing the feasibility and reasonability of the potential alternative.

From a NEPA perspective, while a Federal agency must analyze "a range of reasonable alternatives" (as opposed to any and all possible alternatives), and may be required to analyze an alternative that is outside the capability of an applicant and that is outside the jurisdiction of the agency, the threshold question in determining whether to analyze any alternative is whether that alternative would be a "reasonable" alternative. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical and feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense (CEQ 40 Questions; #2a).

To provide for an effective "hard look" at the alternatives the agency must limit the range to those alternatives that will best serve the environmental review process, and not needlessly examine and discuss in depth remote or speculative alternatives that that discussion does not facilitate a better decision making process. As stated in 40 CFR 1502.14(a), the EIS should "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated."

T003-13.4

T003-13.5

T003-13.6

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states, in part, "[t]he Lead Agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives." The California Supreme Court in the Citizens of Goleta Valley case recognized that while an agency's jurisdiction was only one factor to consider, "[t]he law does not require in-depth review of alternatives that cannot be realistically considered and successfully accomplished." In addition, the discussion in section 15364 in the State CEQA Guidelines states that "[t]he lack of legal powers of an agency to use in imposing an alternative or mitigation measure may be as great a limitation as any economic, environmental, social, or technological factor."

Chapter 3 discusses energy conservation, efficiency, and renewable sources of energy, and explains why these potential alternatives were not studied in detail in the EIS/EIR. The range of alternatives studied in detail is reasonable and conforms to NEPA and the CEQA requirements.

1 choice of alternative sitings of a specific project.

2 This project appears to have considered
3 alternative sites and only given us one to choose from, so
4 we don't really have one to choose from.

5 Thank you.

6 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is -- I'm
9 going to encourage people to withhold their applause, only
10 because we have a large number of commentors to get through,
11 and it's just slowing us down a bit. I want to make sure we
12 get to everybody.

13 The next series of speakers are Leah Lacayo,
14 Joseph Geld -- I can't read it, I think it's Geldnof or
15 Geldhof. Valerie Dunwoody, Peter Torrell, and David
16 Hermanson.

17 Leah Lacayo.

18 MS. LACAYO: My name is Leah Lacayo, and I am here
19 on behalf of my husband, Hank Lacayo, who is ill and not
20 able to appear before you, today. I wish to read a
21 statement that he would have made, had he been able to be
22 here today.

23 "Thank you for allowing me to speak
24 briefly before you, today. My name is
25 Hank Lacayo and I am currently serving

T003-13.6
(cont'd)

COMMENTER
T003-14

1 my second term as State President of the
2 Congress of California Seniors.

3 "My wife, Leah, and I, have lived
4 in Ventura County for more than 18 years
5 and continue to work hard to help
6 improve the quality of life for many
7 Latino and hard-working families in
8 under-served communities. In fact, I
9 have devoted my entire life to serving
10 and representing my community as a
11 volunteer, because I feel strongly that
12 everyone should have a voice.

13 "I am here today because I support
14 Cabrillo Port. I support Cabrillo Port
15 because it will provide us with an
16 affordable, reliable, and safe natural
17 gas supply to operate our businesses,
18 warm our homes, and cook our food. I
19 support Cabrillo Port because it will
20 deliver liquified natural gas, that has
21 been used worldwide for decades, to help
22 prevent another energy crisis in the
23 future.

24 "I did not come to this decision
25 lightly. Many, who know me in the

T003-14.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T003-14.1

1 community, know that I only support
2 issues that I wholeheartedly believe in
3 and strongly feel would be a benefit to
4 the community. As a father, Veteran,
5 husband, senior, community activist, and
6 volunteer in this County for years,
7 caring for the needs of the under-served
8 and working class, I care deeply for our
9 community and its safety. I would not
10 endorse a project that I believed did
11 not and could not make a commitment to
12 ensure that public safety is the number
13 one priority.

14 "I believe the draft Environmental
15 Impact Report adequately and
16 appropriately addresses the public
17 safety concerns that have been expressed
18 by those individuals opposed to the
19 project. It definitely puts my mind at
20 ease knowing that the top experts for
21 your three agencies, with the
22 appropriate LNG and public safety
23 backgrounds, worked on this report to
24 offer a valid and thoroughly vetted
25 analysis regarding public safety.

T003-14.1
(cont'd)

1 "I support an open, constructive,
2 and reasoned dialogue about Cabrillo
3 Port, because I believe when the people
4 of this community, and the State, have
5 all of the facts, they will understand
6 that Cabrillo Port will be built to the
7 highest public safety and environmental
8 standards, and will provide clean, safe,
9 reliable energy to meet Ventura County's
10 and California's ever-growing energy
11 needs today and in the future.

12 "I hope that members of the
13 community will hold judgment until they
14 are able to read the Environmental
15 Impact Report and get all of the facts,
16 facts based on science, technology, and
17 scientific expert knowledge, not myth
18 and disinformation.

19 "Thank you for giving me the
20 opportunity to express my support for
21 Cabrillo Port to you, today."

22 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

23 The next speaker is Joseph Geldhof.

24 MR. GELDHOF: Thank you very much. My name is Joe

25 Geldhof, and I'm with the Marine Engineers Beneficial

T003-14.1
(cont'd)

COMMENTER
T003-15

1 Association, and I've traveled here from Alaska. Which may
2 raise the question, why would anybody come from Alaska to
3 participate in this? Well, the first thing is the weather,
4 which is substantially better than where I live, and the
5 incomparable beauty of the place that you all live.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. GELDHOF: And I should also note I was born on
8 what's now Vandenberg Air Force Base, when my father was
9 called back for the Korean War.

10 But why would I come down here? Well, I work with
11 Mariners worldwide, and they are very familiar with LNG
12 proposals. And it's LNG proposals, whether it comes from
13 the Falkland Prospects, or Indonesia, whether it comes from
14 Australia, or the Arctic, or whether it comes from the
15 Middle East.

16 And the one thing that the Mariners know is that
17 there's an unparalleled record of safe handling of LNG.

18 And in this particular project, the safety factor
19 would be substantially enhanced by the receiving terminal
20 being offshore. So in one sense, calling it LNG, when it's
21 14 miles away and it will be in a gas form, which is very
22 familiar and has been used for decades, onshore, is not
23 really LNG, this is a California gas project.

24 A couple points, based on my perspective as an
25 outsider. The many environmental concerns, be it about

T003-15.1
Thank you for the information.

T003-15.1

1 fish, be it about plants, be it about safety, can, and
2 should be, and have been, to a credible degree, in your
3 State and federal process. Those are real and should be
4 addressed.

5 But the overarching environmental concern, at
6 least for someone like me, is when I fly into a place like
7 Burbank, and see a wall of what looks like a very thick fog
8 bank, that would terrify a Mariner, over this entire basin,
9 the big environmental thing is how are you going to deal for
10 the next 30 years until you get renewables online? And the
11 real environmental challenge is to use, relatively speaking,
12 clean gas, to provide you with a bridge to your renewable
13 future.

14 It can be done in a safe manner. There are
15 security concerns, which are being addressed. I urge you to
16 move forward.

17 And I wanted to disagree, in a very diplomatic
18 way, with the Honorable Consulate General, in one regard,
19 when he said that the Australians stood behind America, the
20 truth of the matter is, starting in decades ago, Australians
21 and Americans have stood shoulder to shoulder in some very
22 difficult circumstances, and they have been worthy and
23 honorable allies in the dark days of 1942, the difficulties
24 in the sixties, and continuing on in the future. And
25 American Mariners are pleased and proud to be working with

T003-15.1
(cont'd)

T003-15.2

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T003-15.2

1 Australians to bring gas, that's very much needed, in this
2 part of the world.

T003-15.2
(cont'd)

T003-16.1
Thank you for the information.

3 Thank you.

4 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is Valerie
5 Dunwoody.

6 MS. DUNWOODY: My name is Valerie Dunwoody.

COMMENTER
T003-16

7 Los Angeles air quality is a major concern in our
8 country's natural -- is a major concern in our country.
9 Natural gas is a clean burning, alternative source of power.

T003-16.1

10 I believe BHP Billiton's Cabrillo Port is an
11 excellent way to bring natural gas to our country, which
12 will improve our air quality, that also gives me -- it also
13 gives me peace of mind that BHP Billiton is also concerned
14 about this and that their LNG carrier is powered by natural
15 gas. I'm glad to see that they are taking this simple, but
16 logical, measure to protect our environment.

T003-16.2

17 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: All right, the next
18 speakers, in order, will be Peter Torrell, David Hermanson,
19 Dr. Craig Shuman, Robert Berman, and John Haynes.

20 Some of you may have signed up since I gave the
21 simple indications that you have three minutes to speak, and
22 when you have one minute left, I'll put up an index finger.
23 And when it's three minutes, I'll put up my closed hands.

24 Mr. Torrell.

COMMENTER
T003-17

25 MR. TORRELL: Thank you. My name is Peter

1 Torrell, and I was initially concerned about the Coast of
2 California, and there being an eyesore out in the ocean. I
3 am pleased to know that BHP Billiton has taken this into
4 consideration and is also not wanting to do something like
5 that.

6 It's obvious to me, because of the visual
7 simulation modeling done by the EIS project team, and BHP
8 Billiton's choice of locating this port 14 miles offshore
9 which, under normal conditions, makes it virtually
10 impossible to see from the shore.

11 I do know that we need more natural gas in
12 California, and also the entire country, and I do support
13 BHP Billiton's proposed Cabrillo Port to bring clean-burning
14 fuel into our country.

15 Thank you.

16 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

17 David Hermanson.

18 MR. HERMANSON: Good afternoon. My name is David
19 Hermanson, I'm speaking here today in support of an LNG
20 project. I'm General Manager of four combined heat and
21 power, or CHP plants, in Southern California. Our plant in
22 Oxnard provides refrigeration services to Boskovich Farms,
23 locally, and sells the electricity we produce to Southern
24 California Edison.

25 I'm also the Chair of the California Cogeneration

T003-17.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T003-18.1

Thank you for the information.

T003-17.1

COMMENTER
T003-18

T003-18.1